DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 209 673 CS 206 639

AUTHOR McGregor, Alastair L.
TITLE Classroom Interactional Routines and Language Varieties: Some Pedagogical Implications.
PUB DATE Apr 81
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Regional Seminar on Varieties of English and Their Implications for English Language Teaching in Southeast Asia (Republic of Singapore, April 20-24, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Communication; Code Switching (Language); *English Instruction; Foreign Countries; Language Research; *Language Styles; *Language Variation; Nonverbal Communication; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Aboriginal People; Australia

ABSTRACT

There can be little doubt that one of the main reasons for the present interest in the study of the varieties of English and their implications for language teaching is the way in which these varieties impinge on one another. Mixed populations from different ethnic sources, geographical areas, and language backgrounds find their representations in and out of the classroom. Studies of the effects of language varieties in the classroom (especially of Australian Aboriginal children) are being carried out in association with the Mount Lawley Language Center in Western Australia. These studies show that in the classrooms where different language varieties are found, students often do not respond to the teacher's control, directions, or questions. It is necessary to study whole interactions to see whether delayed communication acts are not random lapses, but part of an alternative communication strategy on the part of the children who use them. Teachers and all others in "intervariety" situations require as full and detailed an awareness as possible of the features, the communication conventions, and the cultural assumptions of the particular variety of English which they themselves use and of the language varieties with which they are most likely to be dealing. Teachers thus aware of the effects of varieties, and with a range of appropriate skills from which to choose will be able to build in their students from the earliest stages of language learning a similar sensitivity toward their own and other varieties of English. (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED203673

Classroom Interactional Routines and Language Varieties: Some Pedagogical Implications

Alastair L McGregor

Mount Lawley Language Centre
Mount Lawley College of Advanced Education
Western Australia

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Alastair L. McGregor

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Sixteenth Regional Seminar of the SEAMEO Regional Language Centre
on
Varieties of English and their Implications
for English Language Teaching in Southeast Asia

Singapore, 20-24 April 1981

CS206639

CLASSROOM INTERACTIONAL ROUTINES AND LANGUAGE VARIETIES: SOME PEDOGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

This paper is in three parts. In the first section the general setting of the topic is examined briefly. The second gives some examples from studies being carried out in association with the Mount Lawley Language Centre in Western Australia of what is being discovered about varieties and their effects in a classroom setting. Finally some straight forward conclusions on pedagogic implications will be drawn from our growing knowledge about varieties of English.

I. The Present Setting for the Study of Varieties

There can be little doubt that one of the main reasons for the present keen interest in the study of varieties of English and their implications for language teaching is the way in which these varieties are at every turn impinging on one another. Were we, each in our small corners, using a particular variety, or range of varieties, by ourselves, any interest aroused by the topic would be, more or less literally, merely academic. This, however, is far from the case. Our subject has the most direct relevance not merely for language teaching but for many important facets of the lives of our communities. At every point in our shrinking world varieties are impinging on each other as constant movement both within and from without communities creates problems in communication; mixed populations from different ethnic sources, geographical areas and language backgrounds find their representations in our classrooms as well as outside, emigration and immigration, guest workers, educator/researcher/teacher movements - they all contribute to this problem. Such changes are too well known to require much elaboration. One example will suffice. In many situations of immigration the common early pattern was for ethnic 'islands' to appear where many features of the culture and language of origin were preserved with their own institutions - religions, societies, sports, etc. There were many districts in large multi-ethnic cities where one might well have imagined oneself in a different country altogether. Contact with the mainstream culture would usually be by intermediaries though any who had ambitions to progress in the mainstream accepted (when in that context) the language, and indeed values, of that larger society. Such barriers have been rapidly breaking down; there have been moves away from the ethnic islands into other suburbs while a commonality of government-provided institutions has meant that individuals have had to deal directly, rather than through intermediaries, with mainstream institutions on such matters as taxes, housing, education and social services. The results have been understandable and yet rather paradoxical. Original lifestyles and languages have been increasingly

abandoned or modified and yet the consciousness of ethnic diversity has in many cases not merely not decreased, but may even have increased. Recognition of this diversity has been demanded and, very often, the major thrust of these demands has been in connection with language bias such as might exist in selection for jobs or in establishing equality before the law. Hence we have the steady breakdown in England of the previous insistence on using received pronunciation for many positions, or the increasing acceptance of Black English for many purposes and in a wide variety of media in the United States. This may well be because of the growing recognition of the pervasive effects of varieties; we are beginning to see beyond gross accusations of discrimination to something of the subtlety with which varieties can influence images, conclusions and decisions, often in ways quite unrealised or only dimly perceived by the participants themselves.

This growing realisation of the practical implications of differences in variety is, quite naturally, being reflected in a changing emphasis in the study of such varieties. Without attempting to draw any hard and fast lines, (because social implications have never been entirely absent even from early studies), we might, for practical purposes distinguish three stages in such studies. The first stage tends naturally, and no doubt necessarily, to concentrate on the formal markers of a particular variety as represented mainly by phonological, structural and lexical differences; this stage might be represented by such studies as "The Sound System of Indian English" (1972). The development of these studies into the second stage could well be exemplified by that very helpful volume published in Singapore, "The English Language in Singapore" (Crewe, 1977) where the emphasis has plainly changed to the great range of uses and users within one variety and the social status and significance of these sub-varieties. In the third stage - the stage in which we find ourselves in this seminar - the focus has once again changed to the interaction of varieties and sub-varieties and communicative problems which thus arise.

As we enter this third stage of inter and intra variety communication it quickly becomes evident that we have to look far beyond differences in grammar and lexis (though these never lose their importance) to the very substance of interaction, conversational styles and the conventions which govern them. Studies by sociolinguists into turn-taking, ways of opening and closing conversations, tying phenomena (i.e. how semantic relationships between utterances are signalled), interruptions, interjections to

control the course of an interaction, have been used by ethnomethodologists to establish that such conventions differ markedly from variety to variety and to show that it is necessary to study the strategies used regularly in different varieties to understand how a speaker makes himself understood by another speaker of the same variety, i.e. the process of negotiation that is necessary to establish conversational inferences, which of many possible interpretations is to be selected in a particular segment of conversation. These conventions are certainly not ordinary grammatical rules as we quickly realise by the way in which we understand the inferences in the following:-

Speaker A: D' you think he'll let me off this time?

Speaker B: Yes, he'll probably let you off with a warning. He usually lets first offenders off. What's the matter?

Speaker A: Only first offenders?

Speaker B: Usually only first offenders. Why?

Speaker A: Oh, nothing.

(Mortimer, 1972)

In a brief introduction such as this, only mention can be made of many features of any variety which require intensive study because of their importance in this context; non-verbal communication is one such area - gestures, posture, distance - all signal important messages in the interpretation of intention. Thus we have become aware of intentional and unintentional signalling, as in handshakes, bows, nods on the one hand and posture, eye-blinking and eye contact on the other. Study in the uses of such signals reveals something in the nature of a ritual dance where cues are meshed together in corresponding moves. Such signals are used to judge interpersonal relationships and the direction - and shifts in direction - in a conversation. When one combines these with auditory cues such as 'umm', 'hm', affirmative and negative noises and the matching of rhythm, stress and intonation ('back-channel signals') one is confronted by a multiplicity of conversational inferential signals, very well understood by speakers of a particular variety and resulting in a high degree of synchrony between such speakers but allowing for misunderstanding at numerous points where these conventions are not shared. In a fascinating series of studies Erikson and his colleagues (Erikson, 1975, 1980) looked at student-counsellor interviews as regards three levels or channels of communication:-

a) non-verbal signals such as gaze direction, proxemic distance, gestures, etc.

b) paralinguistic features, e.g. pitch, rhythm.

c) implicit semantic content.

Erikson developed what he calls 'indices of a-synchrony' - looking at 'uncomfortable moments' in the interviews related to some mismatch of these signals. Two relationships were clearly established: the greater the synchrony the more usable information was gained by the student from the interview. Secondly, the degree of synchrony was related to the ethnic background and common experiences (or lack of such) of the participants.

This area of concern has been splendidly explicated in a deservedly well known series of studies and papers by John Gumperz and his colleagues (Gumperz J J and Cumperz-Cook J, 1981; Gumperz 1974, 1978, Gumperz, Jupp and Roberts 1979, 1980) to whom I am indebted for much of what can only be touched on in this paper. He shows significant effects resulting from differences in tone of voice and stress, signalling information flow, contrastivness and expressivness. Consider one example quoted by him:-

'In a staff cafeteria at a major London airport, newly hired Indian and Pakistani women were perceived as surly and uncooperative by their supervisors as well as by the cargo handlers whom they served. Observation revealed that while relatively few words were exchanged, the intonation and manner in which these words were pronounced were interpreted negatively. For example, a person who had chosen meat would have to be asked whether he wanted gravy. A British attendant would ask by saying, "Gravy?" using rising intonation. The Indian women, on the other hand, would say the word using falling intonation: "Gravy." We taped relevant sequences, including interchanges like these, and asked the employees to paraphrase what was meant in each case. At first the Indian workers saw no difference. However, the English teacher and the supervisor could point out that "Gravy," said with a falling intonation, means "This is gravy," and is not interpreted as an offer but rather as an announcement. When the Indian women heard this, they began to understand the reactions they had been getting all along which had until then seemed incomprehensible. They then spontaneously recalled intonation patterns which had seemed strange to them when spoken by native English speakers. At the same time, supervisors learned that the Indian women's falling intonation was their normal way of asking questions in that situation, and that no rudeness or indifference was intended.

(Gumperz, 1977)

Of particular benefit is "Crosstalk", the film in which Gumperz and his colleagues were able to bring out many of these underlying features in

inter-variety conversations, interviews, transactions and the like. (B.B.C. 1979). Misunderstanding has been shown to arise from differences, for example, in ways of expressing agreement/disagreement (which may sound harsh or over-direct) and politeness formulae (which may appear to speakers of another variety to be over-done or insincere). The structuring of information can be quite different; for example in one telling job interview sequence the interviewee is asked: "What exactly do you do in your present job?" Instead of directly dealing with the similarities between his present job and the one for which he is now applying the information structuring conventions of the variety of English he uses are quite different, and he answers, first, in generalities, only dealing with specific similarities at the end of his answer. The interviewers, whose conventions are precisely the opposite, have switched off before he gets there and decided that he is vague; his appointment chances are seriously damaged by many instances of such differences in communicative style that are not idiosyncratic but typical of the variety of English used by his community.

There is plainly, therefore, a pressing need for the study of the effects of varieties along these lines in the classroom and it is with this that the second part of this paper will be concerned.

II. Varieties in the Classroom

Let me start by outlining to you three studies which have been or are being carried out in association with the Mount Lawley Language Centre in Western Australia, and which are providing data for the analysis of inter-variety interaction in the classroom.

The key study was carried out by Ian Malcolm with the support of funds from the Department of Aboriginal Affairs, Australia. (Malcolm 1979, 1979a.) Malcolm took as his starting point the fairly consistent picture which has emerged from studies by Bellack (1966), Flanders (Barnes: 1976), Labov (1970), Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), Stubbs (1976) and many others. The teacher, (amongst other features) initiates, provides two thirds of the (lesson) talk in the classroom, monitors classroom communication, gives directions, asks a stream of questions, mostly as a means of controlling pupils' attention, (- most of the questions involving recall of factual information), nominates those who will reply and repeats the answers given. In the classrooms where different language varieties are found, however, normal expectations for these patterns of interaction are often not fulfilled, the teacher's control, directions and questions are often not responded to; she gets silence when she wants

speech and speech when she wants silence.

Dr Malcolm studied the sociolinguistic structuring of classroom interaction in mostly mixed classes with Aboriginal children in thirty four different schools. Many of these children speak a dialect of English with clear phonological, discourse and morphological markers. However the focus of the study was on whether different communicative acts characterise Aboriginal from non-Aboriginal interaction in the classroom and whether there is different participation in classroom routines by Aboriginal children or indeed by teachers interacting with Aboriginal children. There is, of course, no suggestion that other types of sociolinguistic structuring, such as some mentioned earlier in this paper, are insignificant. This study chose to concentrate on a fairly constant domain (the classroom), on the communicative act and the communicative routine. Many examples of classroom interaction involving Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal pupils and teachers were recorded, transcribed and analysed. A total of 125 communicative acts were identified; these can be grouped under 7 functions as related to teachers and children. (For a breakdown of these communicative functions and acts please see Appendix A.) The transcribed classroom interactions were then coded into the form of sequences of communicative acts and regular patterns or 'routines' emerged and were identified, such as the Basic Teaching Routine, the Oral Reading and Comprehension Routine, the Rehearsing Routine, etc.

It quickly emerged that certain speech acts particularly characterize Aboriginal children. "These include, for example, Proxy Eliciting where a child makes an elictation of the teacher by means of another child; Empty Bidding, where a child bids to answer but does not speak when called upon; Deferred R[illegible]ing, where a child pauses for much longer than normal before giving a response; Declined Replying; where a child does not respond to a direct elicitation; Shadowed Replying, where a child delays his reply till he can give it in the "shadow" of the next speaker; and Unsolicited Replying, where a child gives a reply without having been nominated to do so. It is necessary to study whole interactions to see that such communicative acts are not random lapses, but part of an alternative communicative strategy on the part of the children who use them." (Malcolm 1979)

I shall return to point out the type of interference which can occur with normal classroom routines in an inter-variety situation but first let me mention two other Mt Lawley studies which are providing further data.

With the aid of grants from the Education Research and Development Committee we have been for the past three years carrying out a study of the development of English as a second language in children from homes where Vietnamese, Macedonian and an Aboriginal language are used as the medium of communication. Plainly the focus of such a study is quite different but you will appreciate that when about 3 hours of natural language is recorded on each occasion from about 28 children (8-10 in each L_1 subgroup) with some of the language of each child being recorded in the classroom situation (since an attempt is made to sample all situations in which the subjects are normally to be found) we have available, once more, a large number of classroom interactions for analysis. (It may be worth noting that some rather interesting results appear likely to emerge for those interested in L_2 development. It seems that a study from natural language data is, perhaps not surprisingly, bringing to the fore different linguistic features from analyses hitherto made from elicited data. There are many difficulties associated with gathering and analysing natural language data; the main problem with elicited data is, of course, that one gets (or does not get) what one is looking for. One does not get, unless the net is spread virtually as wide as to get natural language, what one is not looking for. As a single example, very near the top of our lists of analysed language comes the use of commands; it would appear that children who receive instructions and directions more or less from the beginning of their L_2 learning, gain an early mastery of this function in order to control each other). I shall return to consider an example of interaction from data gathered in this study (McGregor, 1980).

The third study which is providing much classroom interaction data is part of an Australian national project sponsored by the Curriculum Development Centre and intended to foster the English language capacities of Australian children - both mother tongue and second language users of English - in school years 5-8. This project, in which Mt Lawley is associated with teachers from the Catholic Education Commission, is concerned with classroom talk and is titled: "Patterns of Discourse." With Drs. Malcolm and Williams acting as language consultants to this investigation 15 teachers have been attempting to construct and refine procedures for recording, coding and analysing their own classroom interaction with the intention of developing a model which can be used for the same purpose by teachers in other parts of Australia. At the moment the model for analysing has been completed and some 45 hours of classroom interaction

have been recorded for transcription and coding in speech acts and patterns (similar to those outlined above in Dr Malcolm's study) and in selected features of sentence structures. The intention is to identify and trial discourse strategies which have been isolated as conducive to language development. Again much data has therefore become available on classroom verbal interaction, very often within inter-variety settings.

Within the scope of this paper it is possible to do no more than discuss briefly classroom routines and what happens to them in inter-variety situations. Look first at how Malcolm (1979, p. 12) describes the simplest, and possibly most common, of these routines, the Basic Teaching Routine. This is sequenced as follows:-

1. *An eliciting act by the teacher*
2. *A bidding act by the children*
3. *A nominating act by the teacher*
4. *A replying act by the nominated child*
5. *An acknowledging act by the teacher*

In common inter-variety versions of that routine, however, many speech acts characteristic of Aboriginal children may intervene to force a re-organisation of the communicative chain. The child may employ Empty Bidding and when nominated there may be no reply. There may be Deferred Replying by the child (a long silence before replying) resulting - if the teacher is not prepared to wait - in either Multiple, or rephrased Eliciting or in the teacher turning to nominate another child. On the other hand the class, against the teacher's wish, may provide the answer for the silent nominee in an Unsolicited Reply. How will teacher and children handle the modification of the routine? If a reply is declined will the teacher insist, or supply the answer herself, or pass it on, or leave it unanswered?

I should like to take, as promised, an example from the data gathered in connection with the Mt Lawley second language development study. One routine frequently used by teachers may be called the Individual Discussion Routine. Typically the class group is there in the background, listening while the teacher tries to get a child to express a thought or an idea. The normal routine chain would be as follows:-

1. TN6: Teacher nominates a child as the required respondent - "Hamid;
2. TE1: A question relating to the child's thoughts, opinions or knowledge is then asked by the teacher - what is the capital of Thailand?"
3. CR1: The child replies - "Bangkok"
4. TA1: The teacher acknowledges and accepts the child's reply - "Bangkok; right."

5. (TI: The teacher may choose to add an informing act to the acknowledgement - "And it's by far the biggest city in Thailand as well")

And there the routine will either end or, very commonly, will go into a cycle with a further elicitation to the child by the teacher or a switch to nominate another child to continue the same routine.

Look then at the following inter-variety interaction in which the teacher is essentially trying to use this Individual Discussion Routine. The participants are a non-Aboriginal teacher, three Aboriginal girls: Jane, Tania and Nicole, and a non-Aboriginal boy: Colin. The class is a Grade I - beginners at school, and the interaction is as recorded with only the names changed:-

1.	Teacher:	Wipe your nose on the paper	TD1 Teacher Directing
2.		Now let's have a look	TD13 Marking Boundary
3.		That's very good; lovely work	TA2 Unqualified Accepting

(Jane and Tania are paying little attention to the class activity; they are playing with a doll and cot at the side of the room).

4.	Jane:	Can I 'ave this?	CE1 Eliciting
5.	Tania:	Yes	CR1 Replying
6.	Jane:	I jus wanna have a look at this my step-doll My step-oll My step-doll	CI4 Commentating
7.	Tania:	Ah, I wanna put it this way (Speaking of the cover on the cot)	CI4 Commentating
8.	Jane:	O.K.	CA1 Acknowledging
		See this eh? Ya pur it straight?	CE1 Eliciting

9.	Teacher:	Are you coming to do some work with us, please?	TD10 Retrieving Audience Attention
10.		Quickly, we've got some work to do	TD7 Regulating Time
11.	Jane:	And who are you? Jane (talking still to doll - but them moves to join rest of class)	CX3 Vocalising
12.	Teacher:	O.K. (Indicating the required page of the counting book the class is using)	TD13 Marking Boundary
13.		What have we got on the top line there?	TE2 Check Eliciting
14.		Jane.	TN6 Nominating

15.	Jane:	(Silence)	CR5 Declined Replying
16.	Teacher:	On the top line, what are they?	TE7 Multiple Eliciting
17.	Jane:	(Silence)	CR5 Declined Replying
18.	Several in class:	Spider	CR6 Unsolicited Replying
19.	Teacher:	Spiders (note correction of form)	TA6 Modified Relaying
20.		That's very good	TA2 Unqualified Accepting
21.		Now we're going to count these spiders.	TD16 Foreshadowing
		Altogether we're going to count them and point to them as we count them.	TE1/TD1 Eliciting and Directing
22.		Are you ready? O.K.	TN9 Response Synchronising
23.	Class:	One, two, three, four, five, six.	CR1 Replying
24.	Teacher:	Put the six	TD1 Directing
25.	Class:	(Mostly writing in)	CR13 Reacting
26.	Teacher:	That's right	TA2 Unqualified Accepting
27.		Nicole	TN6 Nominating
28.		What have we got next?	TE5 Linked Eliciting
29.	Nicole:	(Silence)	CR5 Declined replying
30.	Teacher:	What would you call these things? Any ideas.	TE7 Multiple Eliciting
31.		Jane, have you any idea, what are these?	TN6 Nominating
32.	Jane:	(Long pause)	CP3 Deferred replying
		Peanut	CR2 Whispered replying
33.	Teacher:	Speak up	TN12 Regulating volume
34.	Jane:	Peanut	CR2 Whispered replying
35.	Teacher:	Who?	TE11 Looping
36.	Jane:	Peanut	CR2 Whispered replying
37.	Teacher:	Oh, I don't understand	TX1 Vocalising
38.		Oh, peanuts!	TA6 Modified Relaying
39.		What do you think they are	TE1 Eliciting
40.		Colin	TN6 Nominating
41.	Colin:	Birds	CR1 Replying

Few would disagree on the disappointing outcomes of this interaction. Though there are many fascinating questions (eg. the calling of the doll by her own name after the teacher has summoned them) only the most obvious features of this interchange can be looked at. The teacher wishes to engage Jane (and

other members of the class) in the Individual Discussion Routine. This malfunctions from the start because Jane and Tania are engaged in other things, playing with a doll at the side, interacting quite happily together and seemingly oblivious of the teacher waiting impatiently for attention at the front. Here then is the first difficulty; Jane does not seem to wish to take part in the routine at all. The teacher has to summon them and it seems pretty clear that this is, probably correctly, regarded by Jane as correction or displeasure on the teacher's part. She certainly does not come instantly and continues talking with, identifying with, the doll. The teacher then makes the normal first move in the routine, eliciting and nominating Jane. There is no reply. The teacher tries again and must surely be firmly entrenched in her view that Jane is deliberately spoiling the routine when the child again declines to reply. At this point another typical Aboriginal speech act comes out as some in the class move to cover Jane with an unsolicited reply.

Here then is the pattern:-
When the teacher accepts or even synchronises group replying, interaction proceeds. As soon as the teacher returns to individual Aboriginal elicitations replies are declined - by Nicole and Jane again. Finally, after a wait that makes it clear that the teacher is insisting on a reply, Jane switches responses in two ways. Firstly, she offers what may be perhaps a nonsense response ('peanuts' instead of 'birds') and, secondly, knowing the nature of her own response, she makes it (three times) in a whispered reply. The teacher's impatience grows and when she finally does realise what Jane is saying she makes no further comment beyond, for the second time, making a grammatical correction of the proferred reply, and switches the elicitation to another, non-Aboriginal child from whom she obtains an immediate 'correct' response.

Perhaps this example gives a clue as to why so many teachers, particularly young, inexperienced teachers, are prepared to dub Aboriginal children as, at best, shy and, at worst, stubbonly unco-operative or just plain stupid. What in fact is happening is the almost complete failure of a teacher to realise the cultural assumptions and conversational conventions of a different variety of English for, make no mistake, Jane is a native born speaker of a dialect of English. It is not merely a case of analysing at the level of speech acts and routines as we have started to do. Look briefly at these fundamental questions that take us to the level of cultural assumptions:-

1. Is Jane being uncooperative in seeming to refuse to take part

in a 'normal' interaction routine? The child is in the first year of her schooling; she has moved from a community of her own people to a school community. Traditionally in the close kinship system of her Aboriginal community speech is based on known relationships; that society has no provision for communicating with someone one does not know. But now, suddenly, in this traumatic experience of school, the child finds that she is expected to communicate - indeed that great stress is laid upon her communicating - with those she does not know in that sense. To her mind to communicate you must belong, Add to that the fact that she is not only being asked to communicate with people she does not know but about things she does not know, and we are beginning to see a little of her problem.

2. Is Jane not paying attention as she ought? Well, she is certainly not paying attention; she and Tania are having great fun with the doll. but then she has no concept that she 'ought' to be paying attention. The Aboriginal speech convention is quite different. A person to whom a question is addressed has a perfect right, without any discourtesy being implied, simply not to reply. It is an available option. Indeed if persons find themselves in the role of an audience they are positively discouraged from showing inquisitiveness. Audiences are free, like Jane and Tania, to pay no attention, or to interrupt, or indeed to take over from the addresser.
3. Is Jane lacking in the spirit of enquiry? She comes from a background where the kind of knowledge which is most prized is not open to all but is vested in those with power and social control. One is not supposed to distribute such knowledge cheaply, and certainly not to children asking questions. What then is this institution which continually wants to ask and answer questions about things that surely, therefore, cannot be of any great importance?
4. Is Jane really being rather disrespectful to the teacher? The question, as far as she is concerned, is: why should she be respectful? In her community interaction is based on a pervasive awareness of the identity and status of the persons communicating; such status is based on kinship and on access to restricted knowledge. It is not based on vocation. This teacher may well be lower in status than other children in the room; other pupils may have to be deferred to in various ways. On the other hand she may indeed be showing respect by her very reluctance to interact for respect for anyone is demonstrated by verbal reticence towards that person.

Here then is one small example from one classroom of the kind of communication failure which must be happening repeatedly where inter-variety conditions exist. You will readily see not only the negative - one might almost say disastrous - effects in the educational sense, what

is happening to the learning process, but also the ease with which stereotypes of communities or ethnic groups associated with particular varieties can so easily arise or be confirmed: they are lazy, they are unco-operative, they are aggressive, etc. And we have not gone beyond the walls of the classroom at the moment: think of it happening in business, in politics, in government, in social life, in a thousand aspects of our multi-variety society. If we begin to grasp this situation, these communicative mismatches with which our varieties confront us, then we also inevitably begin to grasp the importance of some pedagogical implications which arise.

III. Some Practical Pedagogical Implications

It would require a conference devoted to this topic alone to deal with the implications of such communicative problems for policy makers, curriculum builders, administrators, teacher educators, teachers, pupils, and the community at large. I should like to sum up the implications in three words: awareness, attitudes and skills.

It is surely obvious, firstly, that teachers and all others who carry responsibility in inter-variety situations, those who have been called 'gate keepers', require as full and detailed an awareness as is possible of the features, the communicational conventions and the cultural assumptions of the particular variety which they themselves use and of the varieties with which they are most likely to be dealing. It is astonishing how seldom it seems to occur to us to examine our own communication, to listen to ourselves. It is of course much easier to assume that the pupils or interviewees "aren't paying attention, aren't listening properly, can't express themselves, don't talk much. etc," but such an awareness is often markedly lacking at even quite senior levels of responsibility and regarding even quite obvious linguistic features that differentiate our variety from others with which we are interacting. Such awareness is required not only by language teachers, who may often have more than a glimmer of such insight already, but by all teachers, for learning is severely hampered in all subjects by talking past each other in this way.

You will have no difficulty in seeing what I am arguing for. It seems to me unthinkable that any teacher, administrator or business man should take educational, political, administrative or financial responsibility in an inter-variety situation without a substantial core study of communication and the features of his own variety and those with which he is to be concerned.

B. Secondly, and very briefly, attitudes. Most I believe would agree that serious inter-community damage is done through unexamined attitudes which are so often based unconsciously on reactions to linguistic features. In the Australian situation, for example, features of a variety are judged to be unattractive; for example phonological features may often be considered 'rough' or 'hard' or 'clipped'. One often hears the remark in Australia that Australian English is marked by 'lazy lips' or 'slovenly' word endings. It is almost impossible to prevent these kinds of judgments from being transferred to the people concerned; it is the group which becomes 'lazy' or 'slovenly'. Great benefit would be gained from the core study recommended to avoid such non-linguistic attitudes and judgments.

Interestingly resistance to such awareness and discussion of attitudes is not always confined to those with little interest in the inter-community situation. Criticism of such studies of varieties in contact as "Crosstalk" has come from those who believe that sociolinguistic analysis such as has been illustrated in this paper may appear to give a certain respectability or appear to make excuses for what they would see as naked discrimination. "Such arguments demonstrate a fear of admitting and examining the reality of cultural and ethnic differences." (Gumperz, Jupp and Roberts, 1980).

C. And of course, thirdly, there is a pressing need for training in the development of new skills, new communicational strategies, the ability to be flexible and modify the strategies we employ in our own variety to meet the needs of those from another variety with which we are interacting. Let me return to Jane and her teacher for my examples; a teacher who has become aware of the cultural assumptions and communicative strategies of an Australian Aboriginal English variety might well realise her need for training in the development of quite different classroom strategies. Malcolm points out (Malcolm, 1981, ch. 5) some strategies that would apply in that situation. For example teachers are given to asking questions which require answers demonstrating knowledge, thus putting the child in an unnerving and culturally inappropriate position. To what extent are such questions necessary? They may be helpful for teaching but they are not basic to learning. The Aboriginal child is much more likely to speak in the context of 'exploratory talk' in a relaxed atmosphere without the constraint of "getting the right answer", or

in the 'sharing experiences' kind of talk. It will certainly be easier for the child to function in a "drilling" or "chorus" situation rather than in being singled out individually - again culturally inappropriate. We are hearing much at this time of pupil control in language learning, a strategy that might be particularly appropriate in this situation; the teacher who insists on too tight a personal control of subject matter and discourse pattern may be making it almost impossible for Aboriginal children to participate. Small group strategies would be most effective where the teacher's very unobtrusive participation can have children engaging in quite complicated verbal expression and learning.

If communication is to be successful the teacher's listening skills need to be intensively developed. Teachers are used to the predictability of responses in their own variety, so certain that often they are not even listening, but in inter-variety situations it is the unpredictable that so often occurs and must be heard and used if these children's initiatives are not to be stifled and communication closed down. Similarly considerable skill must be developed in teacher talk such as asking questions; asking 'alternative' questions - 'Did you do this or that' - is to be avoided. Similarly instructions must make clear precisely what is required, somewhat corresponding to Gumperz' emphasis (Gumperz, Jupp and Roberts, 1979, p. 35) on 'clearly stating assumptions'. Similarly one must learn from the communicative code one is dealing with what gives offence or is meant to signal offence, or for that matter, what teacher strategies may be causing offence to the child.

Teachers must learn new strategies of giving the learners success in the new variety or standard which the students may be required to learn; this may require the quiet (non-corrective, accepting) transposition of pupil talk into the standard, and repetition of questions - what Gumperz again stresses (ibid p. 36) as the need for patience, for extra time in order to listen to the end in inter-variety encounters.

A teacher thus aware of the effects of varieties with examined rather than unexamined attitudes towards varieties being contacted, and with a range of appropriate skills from which to choose will be able to build in her pupils from the earliest stages of language learning a similar sensitivity towards their own and other varieties.

REFERENCES

Barnes, D., 1976: From Communication to Curriculum, Penguin, Harmondsworth.

Bellack, A.A., et. al., 1966 The Language of the Classroom, Teachers College Press, New York.

Crewe, W. (ed); 1977: The English Language in Singapore, Singapore, Eastern Universities Press.

Erickson, F. 1975: "Gatekeeping and the melting pot: Interaction in counselling encounters", Harvard Educational Review, 45 (1): 44-70.

Erickson, F. and Shultz J.J., 1980: Talking to 'The Man'; Social and Cultural Organisation of Communication in Counselling Interviews, New York: Academic Press.

Gumperz, J.J., 1974: The Sociolinguistics of Inter-Personal Communication, Working Papers and Publications, No. 33, University of Urbino, Italy.

Gumperz, J.J., 1977: Sociocultural Knowledge in Conversational Inference, Georgetown University, 28th Annual Round Table, Series on Language and Linguistics.

Gumperz, J.J., 1978: Dialect and Conversational Interference in Urban Communication, Lang. Soc., 7, pp. 393-409.

Gumperz, J.J. and Gumperz-Cook, J., 1981: "Ethnic Differences in Communicative Style" in Language in the U.S.A. (in press)

Gumperz, J.J., Jupp, T.C. and Roberts, C., 1979: Crosstalk - A study of Cross Cultural Communication, N.C.I.L.T. in association with the B.B.C., London.

Gumperz, J.J., Jupp, T.C. and Roberts, C., 1980. Crosstalk - the Wider Perspective, N.C.I.L.T., Southall.

Labov, W., 1970, The Study of Non-standard English, National Council of Teachers of English, Champaign, III.

Malcolm, I., 1979: The West Australian Aboriginal Child and classroom interaction - a sociolinguistic approach, Journal of Pragmatics, 3, pp. 305-320.

Malcolm, I., 1979a: Classroom Communication and the Aboriginal Child: A Sociolinguistic Investigation in Western Australian Primary Schools, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Western Australia.

Malcolm, I., 1981: 'Verbal interaction in the classroom' in Eagleson, R., Kaldor, S., and Malcolm I; English and the Aboriginal child (in press)

McGregor, A., 1980: Mount Lawley College Second Language Development Research Project: Research Report No. 1, Mount Lawley College, Western Australia.

Mortimer, C., 1972: Phrasal Verbs in Conversation, London, Longman.

Sinclair, J. McH, and Coulthard R.M., 1973: Towards an Analysis of Discourse: the English used by teachers and pupils, Oxford University Press, London.

Stubbs, M., and Delamont, S., (eds.), 1976: Explorations in Classroom Observation, John Wiley, London.